DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 406 JC 680 421

A Position Paper by the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges.
Michigan State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges, Lansing.
Pub Date Aug 67
Note-52p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.70
Descriptors-*Educational Finance, Financial Policy, *Junior Colleges, *Master Plans, *School Districts, School Funds, *State Legislation
Identifiers-*Michigan

Having determined the philosophy and direction for the state's community colleges, the Board prepared guidelines and a districting plan for their development and operation. The nine guidelines are: an open-door policy; personnel services, guidance and counseling; enrollment reciprocity between districts; avoidance of duplicate programs; flexibility to meet population and transportation needs; high school vocational courses integrated into the college program; no expansion into 4-year institutions; a separate community college board; cultural programs as well as adult and continuing education. Details of the statewide districting plan are given, the new districts to be determined by an enrollment figure approaching 1,000 and expectations of adequate local funds (plus state and federal) to initiate and operate the facilities. These factors are to be reviewed periodically. Proposals for financing both new and existing colleges are presented. Of the ten legislative proposals, the four most crucial were: (1) provision of start-up funds for new colleges; (2) amendments to current legislation concerning the establishment of new colleges; (3) an appropriation of $50,000 to study new districting; and (4) special legislation for the establishment of a Wayne County community college. (1), (2), and (4) have been passed; (3) will be federally funded. Previous studies and reports are reviewed in the appendix. (HH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# STATE OF MICHIGAN

# A

# POSITION PAPER

# By The

# STATE BOARD

# For

# PUBLIC COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

FEBRUARY , 1967

Revised August,1967

ED023406

JC 680 421

# State Board of Education

*Term Expires*

DR. EDWIN L. NOVAK, *President*
Flint ..... Jan. 1, 1973
MISS MARILYN JEAN KELLY, *Vice President*
Detroit ..... Jan. 1, 1969
DR. PETER OPPEWALL, *Secretary*
Grand Rapids ..... Jan. 1, 1971
CARMEN DELLIQUADRI, *Treasurer*
Houghton ..... Jan. 1, 1969
DR. LEROY G. AUGENSTEIN
Holt ..... Jan. 1, 1975
THOMAS J. BRENNAN
Dearborn ..... Jan. 1, 1971
DR. CHARLES E. MORTON
Detroit ..... Jan. 1, 1973
JAMES F. O'NEIL
Livonia ..... Jan. 1, 1975

DR. IRA POLLEY, *State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Chairman*
Member, Ex-Officio
GEORGE ROMNEY, *Governor*
Member, Ex-Officio

## State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges

*Term Expires*

Mr. Herbert McCreedy, *Chairman*
Pigeon ..... Jan. 31, 1971
Mr. Richard Tavis, *Vice-Chairman*
Flint ..... Jan. 31, 1973
Dr. John A. McLean, Jr., *Secretary*
Detroit ..... Jan. 31, 1973
Mrs. Donald Bacon
Ann Arbor ..... Jan. 31, 1969
Mr. Charles A. Boyer
Manistee ..... Jan. 31, 1975
Dr. Tony Brouwer
Grand Rapids ..... Jan. 31, 1971
Mr. James Dotsch
Garden ..... Jan. 31, 1969
Dr. Alfred Meyers
Detroit ..... Jan. 31, 1975

Dr. Ira Polley, *State Superintendent of Public Instruction*
Member, Ex-Officio

Published by
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Lansing, Michigan

CONTENTS


PREFACE

I INTRODUCTION

II GUIDELINES FOR DISTRICTING MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

III PROPOSALS FOR FINANCING COMMUNITY COLLEGE DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION

IV LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

APPENDIX



UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 20 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Immediately after its appointment in July, 1965, the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges agreed that a statement of policy including criteria for community college development should be drafted and after approval submitted to the State Board of Education. It asked its Administrative Secretary to begin work on such a Position Paper.

On March 9, 1966, a technical committee composed of community college consultants from Wayne State University, University of Michigan, Michigan State University, and Western Michigan University was appointed to work on this project. At a later date, Dr. Harold Smith of the Upjohn Institute, Kalamazoo, who is preparing the state plan for higher education in Michigan for the State Board of Education, also worked with this group.

A preliminary draft was submitted to the State Community College Board in the late spring of 1966. It was discussed at length but no decision was made regarding it.

After the selection of an Executive Director in August of 1966, the Board directed the Executive Director to re-write the Position Paper incorporating the work that had already been done and to include the current thinking of the Board.

The first draft of this paper was presented to the Board in January, 1967. After review by the Board it was then re-written

and discussed with the technical committee. Also reviewing the paper was Dr. Richard Browne, Consultant to the Bureau of Higher Education and formerly Director of Higher Education, State of Illinois.

In order to obtain as comprehensive a review as possible, the Board, in cooperation with the Michigan Council for Community College Administrators and the Michigan Association of Community College Boards, planned a series of three public hearings for the purpose of reviewing the document and to receive suggestions and counsel as to how it could be improved and strengthened. At each of the meetings, the Board requested that anyone desiring to turn in a critique of the Position Paper was welcome to do so.

The suggestions and help given by the Michigan Council for Community College Administrators and members of Boards of Trustees proved invaluable to the final product.

At its August 9, 1967 meeting, the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges reviewed the final draft of the Position Paper and after several editorial changes moved for its adoption. Approval was unanimous.

## PART I - INTRODUCTION

The role of the community college is constantly being strengthened and adapted to meet the accelerating pace of change and the increasing demands by our society for educational opportunity beyond the high school level. It has in a relatively short time become an integral part of this nation's vast educational complex. Correctly perceived, the secondary school program, the comprehensive community college program, and college and university programs must complement and strengthen each other.

The community college is becoming the one versatile educational institution with the flexibility and adaptability to meet the ever changing requirements of community needs in a dynamic world. It is coming of age under the spiraling needs that a modern, democratic society has for educated and trained manpower. It offers hope that in this nation there shall not exist an educational gap breachable only by the economically, the socially, or intellectually elite.

Public community colleges can and should provide additional educational opportunities leading not only to advanced academic study in our four-year institutions of higher education, but also to the best in continuing education programs, in vocational/technical, occupational and re-training programs, in general and in broad educational programs beneficial to the entire community and to society, in diversified community enrichment activities and functions

that will elicit maximum participation by both youths and adults.

Because of its multi-purpose educational function, a community college to be most effective must recognize individual and community differences, needs and the social and economic worth of a wide range of interests, capacities, aptitudes, talents and intellectual bent. Conceivably the late President Kennedy had this in mind when he noted that "...an absence of college facilities in many communities causes an unfortunate waste of some of our most promising youthful talent. A demonstrated method of meeting this particular problem effectively is the creation of two-year community colleges."

By its very nature and unique character, a community college precludes the development of a simple set of guidelines for its creation and establishment. The task is complex and is made even more difficult by the need to anticipate the future. Whatever guidelines are proposed they must be aimed at answering several critical questions:

- What should be the proper role and educational programs of community colleges during the next ten years?
- How accessible and available should the opportunity for community college education and training be for Michigan youth and adults?
- What is the best possible solution for districting for the support and control of a community college?

- What should be the financial sources and methods for the establishment and operation of a community college?

During the past twenty-five years, various responsible and authoritative individuals, groups, appointed committees and commissions in Michigan have studied the problem of establishing and operating a community college. The reports and the recommendations that have been the result of these studies provide a valuable perspective for the present, keeping in mind, of course, that significant changes have taken place not only in educational concepts and beliefs, but also in the criteria and basis for the establishment of community colleges.

The State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges reviewed available community college studies and reports, Appendix A, as one initial step that had to be taken in preparation of a position paper. The material reviewed is as follows:

The Michigan Public Education Study Commission's report, The Improvement of Public Education in Michigan, Dr. E. B. Elliott, Chairman, Lansing, Michigan, 1944.

Some Criteria for the Establishment of Community Colleges with Reference to Michigan, Dr. Russell Foster Fink, Michigan State University, 1952.

Michigan Commission on Community Colleges, Report of the Sub-Committee on Community Colleges, (Unpublished mimeographed report, June, 1955).

Michigan Junior and Community College Study Commission, Final Report to the Governor, (Unpublished mimeographed report, August, 1958).

The Community College in Michigan, S. V. Martorana, Staff Study No. 1, The Survey of Higher Education in Michigan for the Michigan Legislative Study Commission on Higher Education, Lansing, 1957.

The Citizens on Higher Education, Report to the Governor, Lansing, Michigan, 1965.

Michigan Council of Community College Administrators, Suggested Community College Portion of a State Plan for Higher Education, (Unpublished mimeographed report adopted in November, 1965.)

In general it can be said that the studies and reports indicated certain trends, philosophy and direction as to the development, establishment and operation of community colleges. Directional recommendations specifically indicated by these studies are as follows:

- Any future organization of a community college should provide for a separate and autonomous operation precluding any control by a local K-12 school board.
- A larger local tax base is necessary for the operating districts, and a larger percentage of operational and buildings costs must be assumed by the state.
- Tuition charges should be low enough to prevent them from becoming financial barriers to community college attendance.
- A state-wide districting plan to include all Michigan residents in a community college district should be adopted and implemented.

- A larger full-time student enrollment, as compared to the past, is needed as a criterion for the establishment of districts.
- Relatively recent studies indicate that some community colleges may need to become resident colleges with housing made available to students, rather than strictly a commuters' college, particularly in sparsely settled areas of the state.
- All community colleges should be able to present a basic program and some a comprehensive program that would include collegiate and non-collegiate level education as well as occupational and re-training programs.

Through its own study, observation, appraisal and work since its appointment in July, 1965, the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges quite naturally reached many of these same conclusions.

It is with this background that the following guidelines and districting plan are presented.

## PART II - GUIDELINES FOR DISTRICTING MICHIGAN PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The growth and development of public community colleges in Michigan since 1957 has been so dramatic that their importance was recognized by the 1963 Michigan Constitution which states:

"The Legislature shall provide by law for the establishment and financial support of public community and junior colleges which shall be supervised and controlled by locally elected boards. The Legislature shall provide by law for a state board for public community and junior colleges which shall advise the State Board of Education concerning general supervision and planning for such colleges and requests for annual appropriations for their support."

The Constitutional intent is clear and if community colleges are to fulfill their unique and intended role in Michigan's broad and comprehensive higher education program it is obvious that:

- Citizens in all geographic areas within the state shall have access to community college programs and be included in an appropriate district structure; and
- All community college districts shall be so established, so operated and so financed as to provide high quality training and instruction, optimum students services, adequate plant, adequate enrollment and equipment at a minimum cost to the student and his family.

Accordingly and based on a review of all relevant literature as identified in Part I and upon recent staff reports and studies, the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges after asking the advice of community college administrators and members of boards of trustees at regional meetings, adopts the following guidelines to insure the future individual and collective orderly development of community colleges in Michigan and to aid in statewide districting for community college service areas:

1. Each community college shall adhere to an "open door" policy within its respective district to permit any qualified person, young or old, to enter or re-enter into available programs in pursuit of further study or training if so motivated.

2. Organized programs of personnel services, guidance and counseling must be an important and an accepted part of the responsibilities of a community college. Students must be informed of all available opportunities. Such services should help students to make appropriate educational and vocational plans and choices; to orient them in the community college areas; to evaluate their abilities, aptitudes, and interests; to select and transfer upward or laterally in programs; and to resolve problems of admissions, finances, health and other personal matters.

3. Differences in community college programs are to be expected and encouraged. However, this must be accompanied by a flexible and realistic policy of student enrollment reciprocity between community college districts. Such a policy of enrollment reciprocity should make it possible for students who qualify for specialized community college programs to enroll in such programs regardless of their residence. Further, it is recognized that some courses can more efficiently and economically be provided in one or two locations in the state and state policy should effectuate this intent to minimize unnecessary duplication of cost and effort. Under this policy costs to the non-resident student should not be significantly greater than the cost to the resident district student. Perhaps one method that could be used to cover the cost difference would be a charge-back to the sending district.

   In addition, there must be a specific deliniation between two-year institution programs and four-year institution programs. Associate degree programs or programs completed in two years or less should not be offered at the four-year institutions unless specifically approved by the State Board of Education. (NOTE: Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 112, adopted by the Michigan Senate on June 30, 1967, and by the Michigan House of Representatives on July 8, 1967, states "...that the boards of control of the state's public four-year colleges and universities be

directed to cooperate in offering only those associate degree or occupational-technical programs which will not compete with or weaken programs being offered by the public community and junior colleges, .."

4. The State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges, in order to advise the State Board of Education in planning for the orderly development of higher education, will review all new community college programs. Such new programs will be reviewed among other reasons to avoid uneconomical duplication with similar programs of relatively low enrollment in neighboring districts. Specific courses, within programs, will be determined by the institution. Based on thorough and objective study, including consultation with local advisory boards and a statewide approach, recommendations will then be made regarding the location of various unique programs.

5. A statewide plan for the establishment and development of community colleges and community college districts must have the adaptability and flexibility that will provide the most efficient solution to problems arising from population and transportation disparities relative to educational needs. For example, in sparsely settled areas, where long distances are involved, dormitories permitting resident students, mobile

classrooms, traveling teams of instructors, and bussing of students - all should receive consideration and evaluation. In urban areas of dense population and relatively rapid transportation, a district involving several coordinated campuses should receive the same careful consideration and evaluation.

6. Vocational/technical, occupational education must have its initial beginnings early enough in the secondary school program to permit close integration and coordination through the late high school years and into the community college program. In order to strengthen this continuum, post-secondary area vocational centers should be established in conjuction with a community college district and not as spearate units. The State Board of Education has adopted a policy statement to this effect.

7. A community college cannot retain its unique multi-purpose service role if its efforts are directed toward becoming a four-year institution. Therefore, no community college should expect to be permitted to expand into a four-year institution.

8. Because of the distinctive philosophy and service of the community college toward specialized community education

and training, a governing board separate from that of the secondary and elementary school district should be considered in every community college district not so governed. Those several districts now operating community colleges under K-12 school boards should be encouraged to initiate comprehensive studies toward establishing separate governing boards as soon as possible. The State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges recognizes that there are, in these K-12 community college operations, unique situations and problems that must be resolved. Consideration should be given by the state to allow use of previous capital investment by these K-12 community colleges as matching funds in any evolving district.

9. A community college should strive to enrich its total program not only through its adult and continuing education offerings but also through cooperation with available community cultural resources.

As indicated in Part I, various studies in the last several years have suggested plans for statewide community college districting and for the establishment of new community colleges. Because new community colleges were planned, a continuing re-assessment and review was obvious. At the present time there are three factors that have to be considered in the development

of a statewide community college districting plan:

1. As of August, 1967, there are 18 operating community college districts; 6 operating as part of a K-12 school district organization; and 4 districts that have been approved and are established but are not yet in operation.

2. There has to be a determination as to what areas in the state not now covered have the potential to become a community college district.

3. And, finally, it has to be determined how all remaining areas in the state can best be annexed to existing community college districts or included in potential districts.

Any proposal for community college statewide districting would have to be determined on the basis not only of the above factors, but also several others such as:

- What objective analysis shows the present established community college service areas to be;

- Potential enrollments;

- State equalized valuation;

- Area vocational studies.

In the Upper Peninsula the establishment of three or four additional community college districts is suggested. State policy should permit the boards of these three or four new districts in their beginning operation to arrange for contracted services with four-year institutions.

In the Lower Peninsula, excluding Wayne County, possibly three new community college districts could be considered. Wayne County, because of its concentration of population, unique needs and problems, must be considered separately. It would be highly desirable that all of Wayne County not now included in one of the three existing community college districts become one community college district.*

In the establishment of new community college districts, regardless of where they might be located - Upper or Lower Peninsula - the state is going to have to assume a larger share of the initial "start-up" costs for both operation and capital outlay.

The establishment of new community college districts must also be supplemented by a positive policy of annexation for those areas which will be better served by this means than by the creation of additional community college districts.

* Act 285 of the Public Acts of 1967 provides for this arrangement

Annexations would be based on thorough study and review by the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges in cooperation with and the help of the communities and citizens of those areas to be annexed and the districts to which annexation is proposed. Recommendations would then be made to the State Board of Education. The intent would be to strengthen existing community college districts from the standpoint of both enrollment potential and local financing. Another consideration, of course, would be the likely establishment, in the future, of additional campuses in the larger community college districts.

The following will guide the Board in the determination of new community college districts:

1. Ideally and from historical background and study it would appear at the present time that after a reasonable number of years of operation, a new community college district enrollment potential should approach the figure of 1,000 full-time equivalent students. It is generally agreed that a comprehensive community college and community service program is difficult to achieve with an enrollment that does not begin to reach the 1,000 mark.

2. A proposed community college district should have in the immediate foreseeable future adequate local financial resources so that when combined with state, federal funds and minimum student charges will permit the operation of a basic quality educational and community service program. In order to allow a new community college district to begin operation as quickly as possible without the handicap of a financial deficit, the state should provide funds to permit initial planning for operation.

3. Newly established community college districts having received "start-up" funds for initial operational purposes, should have sufficient local financial resources so that when combined with state and federal funds it can sustain an adequate and realistic capital outlay program. In some cases, to facilitate the initial training and instructional operation, the use of existing educational facilities should be considered.

Recognizing rapidly changing social, economic, political and educational conditions, these criteria shall be reviewed periodically by the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges in order that necessary and needed revisions can be incorporated and modifications made to meet new requirements and demands of Michigan higher education. Working in cooperation with boards of trustees, administrators and areas in the state that will be involved, the Board is now in the process of preparing a state districting plan for community college districts.

## PART III - PROPOSALS FOR FINANCING COMMUNITY COLLEGE DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION

The primary financial responsibility for the operation and establishment of community colleges lies with the state. The 1963 Michigan Constitution charges the Legislature to provide "...by law for the financial support of Public Community and Junior Colleges."

There are numerous tax studies indicating clearly that our present property tax structure, primary source for local educational funds, is antiquated, outmoded and obsolescent. While local financial participation should be maintained and encouraged, it must be recognized that there are areas in the state that do not now, nor will they in the foreseeable future, have the necessary funds to even start, much less operate, an effective and comprehensive community college program.

If the state is to provide adequately for community college financing for development and operation, then there must be a sharp increase in state support for both operational purposes and capital outlay. Community colleges cannot fulfill their higher educational responsibilities unless they are vigorously supported at the state level. The magnitude of the task facing them right now has outrun present methods of distributing funds. New

approaches are mandatory.

Therefore, recognizing these difficulties and problems for new community colleges:

- There should be funds available to cope with starting-up costs, including funds to allow a new community college district to contract with other educational institutions for services. In addition, funds on a pro-rated basis should be made available to existing community colleges that find themselves not able to provide a comprehensive program.

- There should be state support for capital outlay on a long term basis and at the 75 to 100 percent level for initial building programs.

For all operating community colleges, in the distribution of state funds:

- A differential in state support should be provided and should be based on need and local tax effort.

- State funds should be provided in full for a basic community college program and state funds should also be provided on a pro-rated basis for all programs.

- Cost differences between academic and vocational/technical/occupational programs should continue to be recognized but with a more significant and realistic differential than that presently used.

- There should be greater capital outlay support in order that community college districts can better meet expansion needs resulting from rising enrollments.

## PART IV - LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

To expedite and to facilitate the earliest possible establishment of community college districts where none now exist and to strengthen the operation of those already established, the following steps are recommended for the 1967 Legislative session. *

1. In addition to obtaining more adequate and equitable support for all community colleges, the State Board of Education, in cooperation with local community college boards, should initiate legislation which would provide, upon the establishment of a new community college district, pro-rated start-up funds based upon application and the estimated enrollment at such colleges. (NOTE: Although legislation was not introduced for this specific purpose, recognition of this need by the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges had a direct bearing on the Bureau of the Budget's recommendation that additional funds be provided for this purpose. Such funds were included in Act 240 of the Public Acts of 1967.)

* Of the ten suggested legislative proposals, the decision was made to concentrate on four that were deemed most critical: 1. Start-up funds for new community college operations; 2. Amendments to Act 331; 3. Appropriation of $50,000 to conduct studies for possible community college districting in the state; and, 4. Legislation to establish a community college district in Wayne County excluding established and operating districts. Three of the four pieces of legislation were enacted into law.

2. The StateBoard of Education, in cooperation with local community college boards, should initiate legislation to provide state financing for a basic program of instruction in all community colleges in the state. Beyond this basic program, state funds based upon local need should be provided on a pro-rated basis to encourage comprehensive community college programs.

   For those community colleges whose programs are determined to be already beyond the basic program, such state funds should be provided on a pro-rated basis which may or may not be in excess of the amount allowed for the basic program.

3. The State Board of Education, in cooperation with local community college boards, should initiate legislation to provide a 10-year capital outlay program which would make available substantial state funds on a pro-rated basis for site acquisition and construction to insure adequate facilities based upon projected enrollment.

4. The State Board of Education should initiate legislation amending present laws which give it supervision on the establishment of community colleges through the disapproval of applications. Such amendments are needed to allow for positive leadership and guidance by the State Board in order to insure the best

possible community college development.

5. The State Board of Education, in cooperation with local community college boards, should begin a study of possible legislative proposals to allow the greatest possible latitude to individual community college boards in combining their efforts to provide for greater service, efficiency, economy and programming between districts.

6. The State Board of Education should discuss with community college boards their concern about adequate state support and tax resources and determine cooperatively what legislative actions need to be taken to realize greater state support.

7. The State Board of Education recognizing that the several K-12 school districts now operating community colleges have a considerable investment in facilities, equipment and other buildings, should, in cooperation with these districts, explore means by which credit may be given for this investment. Perhaps these invested funds could be used for a local matching share when state funds are requested for capital outlay purposes in the event that the community college becomes an operation separate from the K-12 school district.

8. The State Board of Education should consider amendments to Act 331, Sections 15, 35 and 55 that would permit districts planning to vote to establish a community college the option to vote on all three parts or on any single part(s) of the listed sections. (NOTE: Senate Bill 630 incorporated amendments to Act 331, Sections 15, 35 and 55. Passed successfully, becoming Act 285 of the Public Acts of 1967.)

9. The State Board of Education should request an appropriation of $50,000 to be used by the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges to conduct studies at the local level to determine the need for the establishment of new community colleges and to determine the best possible districting of areas that could be annexed to existing community colleges. (NOTE: House Bill 2896 was introduced for the purpose of a $50,000 appropriation. The bill died in committee. However, under provisions of a federal comprehensive planning grant of $134,000 such local studies are possible.)

10. The State Board of Education should consider the establishment of community college district in Wayne County by legislation. Such legislation if given immediate effect would permit Wayne County to begin at once to take steps to implement that community

college opportunity. (NOTE: Senate Bill 630, which became Act 285 of the Public Acts of 1967, was amended to include a new chapter to the community college act, chapter 5. This chapter established a community college district in Wayne County exclusive of already operating community college districts.)

The State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges is greatly appreciative of the cooperation and help given by the Michigan Council of Community College Administrators and the Michigan Association of Community College Boards in the development of this Position Paper.

Believing that the foregoing to be in keeping with the intent and purposes set forth in the Constitution, anticipatory of demonstrated needs and reflective of popular desire, the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges recommends adoption and inclusion of this Position Paper in Michigan's State Plan for Higher Education.

# APPENDIX

## A REVIEW OF PREVIOUS STUDIES AND REPORTS

## A REVIEW OF PREVIOUS STUDIES AND REPORTS

The Michigan Public Education Study Commission. In 1944, the Michigan Public Education Study Commission issued a series of maps outlining proposed public school district organizations in Michigan. [1] Some of these districts were identified as being sufficiently wealthy and populated to extend their educational offerings to include what the Commission termed as the "thirteenth and fourteenth years". Not pretending to make an authoritative survey of higher education in Michigan, the Commission recommended as follows:

> "Equalization of individual opportunity currently demands the rapid extension of the upper secondary school to include the thirteenth and fourteenth years with provision for all youth instead of only a small selected group. These upper years may be organized as a four-year senior high school or as a community college and should be provided in selected centers wherever a sufficient student load makes their operation economical."

The Fink Study. In its search for approaches to the development of guidelines for community college development, the Board noted that Dr. Fink, in 1952, developed some criteria for the establishment of community colleges with special reference to Michigan. He developed these from the conclusions reached as a result of an exhaustive appraisal of state-wide studies conducted by authorities in twenty states. The criteria extracted by Fink are listed as follows:

1. High school enrollment is a basic criterion: 500 in grades IX-XII should be the minimum, with 800 in grades XI-XII as a more desirable minimum.

2. Approval of a representative, independent, non-political state educational agency is desirable.

3. Approval of the local community, ascertained by petition, referendum, or intensive community study, is desirable.

4. Existing educational institutions cannot be ignored. Neither should community college opportunities be denied young people of a given community simply because an established institution of higher learning operated in the community.

5. Minimum tax valuation is of little use as a criterion. In Michigan, at least, if the high school enrollment minimum is met, the tax valuation minimum generally is also met.

Assuming that community colleges would be operated by school districts on the basis of the statutes existing in 1952, Fink applied the foregoing criteria to the situation in Michigan at that time. He concluded that the school districts of Alpena, Battle Creek, Midland, Monroe, Niles, Owosso, Saginaw, Cadillac, Petoskey, Kingsford-Iron Mountain, Calumet, Escanaba and Menominee should be among those which should strongly consider the establishment of a new community college.

The Michigan Commission on Educational Policies. The Michigan Commission on Educational Policies adopted a report of its Sub-committee on Community Colleges in June, 1955. This report included some suggested criteria for the Superintendent of Public Instruction to use in his statutory role of approving initial proceedings to establish community colleges. These criteria are listed as follows:

1. A study of the proposed service area should be available. This study should include such factors as listed below.

   a. Definition of service area.
   b. Population composition and trends.
   c. Economic and social trends.
   d. Tax bases, present and estimated future tax rates, and proposed financial budget for a 3 year period or longer.
   e. Evidences of community interest and desire on the part of the people in the proposed service area.
   f. Estimated initial and future enrollments in a community college program.

2. There should be expressed interest and desire on the part of the people in the proposed service area. In those cases where a vote is not required there should be some other evidence of community wide desire. An example of such evidence in either case might be a resolution by each of the community serving organizations and legal bodies within the proposed service area. Another example of evidence might be a public opinion survey conducted by the board of education or some other qualified and unbiased agency.

3. The population in the proposed service area should be sufficient to insure the efficient operation of a well-rounded program. High school enrollments might well be an important indication of probable enrollees in a community college. Enrollments in adult courses in the public schools and in veterans' on-the-job training programs are other significant indicators of potential enrollments.

4. The tax base and taxing power should be sufficient to give assurance of enough local financial support for continued operation over a long period. The local support should be sufficient to meet operational costs over and above state aid subsidies and tuition charges. Local support for plant should be considered also.

5. Locations of existing and proposed educational institutions and their offerings should be pertinent factors in determining the need for establishing and the function of the community college under consideration. Overlapping service areas should be prevented insofar as practical. Neither should community college opportunities be denied to people of a given area merely because an established institution of higher learning operates in the community.

6. A proposed educational program should be developed covering at least a two-year period which has basis in expressed as well as other needs of the community. Consideration should be given to those persons who wish to continue immediately from the 12th grade in high school, to those individuals whose formal schooling may have been interrupted for a time, and to those persons who seek to continue their education throughout the adult years. The proposed program should allow for the leadership and consultative role of the college with groups engaged in programs for community service.

7. In those cases where two or more districts have agreed to jointly operate a community college, the exact nature of the agreement should be recorded with evidences of good faith on the part of the authorities in the respective districts. The agreement should cover a period long enough to give assurance of stability to the community college program in the formative years.

In respect to the programs to be offered by community colleges, the report of this Commission included the following statement:

"The community college should be a locally operated and locally controlled institution designed to serve the educational needs of a community beyond the 12th grade program. Normally, these needs may be met by educational programs which include the usual courses of the freshman and sophomore years in four-year colleges and universities, vocational (technical), general and other types of courses for older youths and adults. In addition, the community college should serve as a cultural center for the community.

Higher Education, in accordance with present day thought and practice, is defined for the purposes of this committee as those types of educational programs which provide institutional credit toward at least the baccalaureate degree granted by an institution accredited for such purposes. Under this definition the average community college will usually function only partly in the educational field presently known as "higher education".

"The community college program should be developed by the local governing body consistent with the manner in which other local public school programs are defined and developed."

The Commission also presented a viewpoint concerning the degree to which students should be required to pay part of the costs of the community college operational costs. The report included the following viewpoint:

> "Tuition charges should be as small a barrier to community college attendance as practicable. Eventually, most communities may desire to eliminate tuition entirely as some community colleges do now. In the meantime, it is proposed that tuition charged by the community college to the individual student should not exceed one-third of the cost of operation."

Two additional reports made about one and one-half years apart were also studied and analyzed. The first of these was a mimeographed report of Staff Study No. 1 of the Survey of Higher Education in Michigan prepared by Mortorana in June, 1957. The second of these was a report of the Michigan Junior and Community College Study Commission to Governor Williams on August 20, 1958.

Staff Study No. 1 of Legislative Study of Higher Education in Michigan. In respect to criteria for locating needed new community colleges in Michigan, Martorana identified a single fundamental criterion, that being simply the presence of concentrations of populations sufficient to guarantee 200 full-time students in the regular day program. He discounted assessed valuation of the district to support the community colleges as a significant criterion because he assumed that these would be established by school districts with adequate financing, properly equalized by the states through its state aid plan. On the basis of his single criterion and with recognition

to community colleges already established, Martorana recommended first priority to the locating of new community colleges as follows:

1. Three in Detroit; Three outside Detroit to serve Wayne County
2. One in Pontiac; One in Royal Oak to serve Oakland County
3. One in Mt. Clemens to serve Macomb County
4. One in Monroe to serve Monroe County
5. One in Three Rivers to serve St. Joseph County
6. One in Niles to serve Berrien County
7. One to serve Allegan - Van Buren County (location by local study)
8. One in Lapeer to serve Lapeer County
9. One in Owosso to serve Shiawassee County
10. One in St. Johns to serve Clinton County
11. One in Saginaw to serve Saginaw County
12. One in Midland to serve Midland County
13. One in Cass City or Bad Axe to serve Huron - Sanilac County
14. One in Ludington to serve Mason - Manistee - Oceana Counties
15. One in Cadillac to serve Wexford - Missaukee - Osceola Counties
16. One in Petoskey to serve Emmet - Charlevoix - Cheboygan - Otsego Counties
17. One in Escanaba to serve Delta County

Martorana also presented some points of view concerning district organization and fiscal support of community colleges in Michigan. His viewpoints are presented, in part, as follows:

"District organization and fiscal support of community colleges are closely related...To strengthen the provisions that apply to district organization for community colleges three basic recommendations are advanced: (1) that a "charge back" provision be adopted which would make a non-community college district in which a student resides responsible for contributing to the support of a community college maintained by another district and from which services are received by the residents of the non-community college district; (2) that on the approval of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and a favorable vote of the people in the area, community college districts encompassing the area of two or more contiguous school districts be authorized to levy taxes and issue bonds for

support of a community college program controlled and operated by the district; and (3) the present specific requirement in the community college law that 10,000 population be the minimum in a community college district be abolished.

The community colleges in Michigan need more financial aid than they are now getting if they are to be held responsible for carrying their share of the educational burden of the State. By 1970 the total cost of operating these institutions may be as high as $37,000,000 a year.

It is suggested that the State work toward establishing a minimum foundation program that will provide $600 per student per year. This figure should be revised periodically by the State agency for supervision of the community colleges to keep it abreast of changing economic conditions and trends in enrollment in the State. The foundation figure should be met from income from tuition to the extent of one-fifth of the total with provision for the local district to assume part or all of this obligation if it can and chooses to do so. The State and the locality jointly should raise the remaining four-fifths with the State paying two-fifths of the costs and the locality two-fifths if it can do so within the limits of taxing privileges allowed in the State. If, having levied the maximum taxes authorized, a locality cannot attain its full share of two-fifths of the minimum foundation figure, the State should make up the difference. The formula would be applied to all districts which have residents attending community colleges, with the non-community college districts paying their portion of the state aid and amount per student raised through their local taxes to the districts maintaining community colleges that their citizens attend.

A similar plan is recommended for financing the capital outlay needed to house the strengthened and expanded community colleges. The expenditure for capital outlay might total as much as $75,000,000 in the next decade. The plan recommended utilizes a formula comparable to the one advanced to cover operating costs except that in this area the State would carry a minimum of 50 per cent and a maximum of 75 per cent of the total costs of approved building construction. The formula should be applied to site acquisition and improvement and to such facilities as parking areas, and student centers (but not to dormitories)..."

Junior and Community College Study Commission. The report to Governor Williams by the Junior and Community College Study Commission, appointed by him in 1956, identified some recommendations concerning guidelines for the establishment of community colleges in

Michigan. Applying these criteria, the Commission identified ten areas of the state which should initiate a local study to determine the feasibility and local desire to establish a community college to serve the respective identified areas. The following is quoted directly from the report:

1. The Commission recommends that the state immediately take steps to expand its leadership and assistance in the development of plans for the establishment of additional community colleges in Michigan. The number of new community colleges and their location should be based on comprehensive state-wide planning and on local interest and need. In our view, the most effective way to achieve this expanded state leadership is the creation of a community college development commission, as recommended in an earlier section of this report.

2. The Commission recommends repeal of the specific requirement of 10,000 population in a community college district, now included in the laws of the state. Population is only one criterion, to be considered along with other more basic and direct criteria. These must be studied, in each community, in all their interrelationships, and no one of them should be so rigidly defined by statute.

3. The Commission recommends that a community college be established in any locality only after intensive study of the community's desire and need for its establishment. Such a study should be made by local citizens who should be assisted by the state. A college should be approved only when such studies have indicated the probability of its fulfilling the functions of a community college and of its effective operation.

   a. This report by the Commission has described the functions of a community college as viewed by the Commission. The recognition of all five functions should be assured before a new community college is established. Community colleges should not be merely technical institutes. The increasing complexity of our civilization requires that would-be specialists develop their talents to the fullest. They must be provided general education as well as specialized vocational training.

b. Extensive analyses of the potential increase of youth must be made. College-age youth is certain to double in number in most areas of the state by 1975 or earlier, and to triple and quadruple in some suburban areas. There were 175,000 young people, 18 and 19 years of age, in the state in 1957, and the number is expected to approximate 360,000 by 1970. Those who are now 18 and 19 years old were born in 1939 and 1940, when birth rates were low -- about 19 per thousand of population. Those who will be of this age in 1970 were born in 1951 and 1952, when there were about 27 births per thousand. Death rates continue to drop. Migration into the state continues to make substantial contributions to all age groups.

c. Specifically, it is recommended that a community college district should generally have 800 or more persons 18 and 19 years of age. Ten of the fifteen existing community college districts presently have this number. Including actual service area beyond district boundaries, probably 13 community college districts now have 800 or more in this age group.

d. A community college should have a full-time equated enrollment of 400 or more within five years after its establishment. Nine of the eleven community colleges that were established prior to 1952 had enrollments this large in 1947-58 (including non-resident students). A community college should have sufficient potential enrollments to permit economical and efficient operation. Mistakes made in establishing the many unnecessarily small high schools in Michigan should not be repeated at the community college level.

e. A community college district should generally have a state equalized valuation of $100,000,000 or more. It is difficult to provide adequate local support for the operation of a college without this much valuation. Ten of the fifteen existing community college districts have valuations of this amount (1957). Three other districts would also have this valuation if they were coterminous with the actual service areas of their colleges.

4. The Commission recommends that community college districts be, as nearly as possible, coterminous with their college service areas. At present none of the existing community college districts is

coterminous with its actual service area. Each college has some non-resident students. The proportion varies from four per cent (Port Huron) to 85 per cent (Highland Park), with an average of approximately 40 per cent for all community colleges. That is, two-fifths of the students in Michigan community colleges live outside the districts which operate the colleges.

The Bay City and Jackson school districts have recently expanded their boundaries by annexation of adjacent and nearby districts which were already served by their community colleges. Such expansion is not possible for some existing districts. For example, Highland Park is completely surrounded by the Detroit and Hamtramck 12-grade districts. Dearborn is almost completely surrounded by Detroit and two other 12-grade districts, with little possibility of annexations.

Problems of tax support are simplified by the formation of community college districts that coincide with their service areas. Problems of collecting tuition costs for non-resident students are minimized. For these reasons, and for other aspects of effective operation, it has been recommended earlier in this report that greater flexibility be provided for the formation of community college districts not limited to a single school district or to county lines.

5. The Commission recommends intensive studies to determine feasible locations for the establishment of new community colleges in those areas of the state in which there is no institution of higher learning that provides both men and women opportunities for at least two years of education beyond high school.

Approximately two-thirds of the counties of Michigan have no higher institutions within their borders. These counties contain two-thirds of the land area of the state and one-fourth of its population. It has been estimated that, while 29.3 per cent of the college-age population of the state attended college in Michigan in 1955-56, the range for counties was from 8.3 per cent in a county without a college to 90.4 per cent in the county where the University of Michigan is located. (Discounting the unusually high percentage for Washtenaw County, the high figure is 42.5 per cent.) For the counties which have a college of some kind -- state college or university, private college, or community college -- the percentage of youth attending college is reported to be 32.9. For the counties with no institution of higher education the percentage is 16.8.

These figures, as well as others, indicate clearly that the number of people of college age who attend college is profoundly affected by the availability of a college or university near their homes. However, the county may be questioned as a basis for determining the area or the population which is or is not served by institutions of higher education. The Commission prefers "commuting distance" as a more realistic basis for such judgments.

Places are considered to be within "commuting distance" if they are located within a radius of 25 miles of a college or university which is south of a line from Bay City to Muskegon, or within a radius of 35 miles of an institution lying north of this line. Figure 1 shows the location of the 24 public colleges and universities and the areas encompassed within their respective radii of either 25 or 35 miles. It also shows the areas beyond commuting distances of these 24 institutions. The latter comprise about one-third of the total land area of the state and half a million people, which is nine per cent of the total population.

If 25 or 35 mile radii are drawn around the private colleges in Michigan, an additional two per cent of the state's population is thereby encircled. Most of the private colleges and universities are located near the 24 public institutions, and therefore there is extensive overlapping of their commuting zones.

It is recommended that local studies be made in ten areas included in the inadequately served territory shown in Figure 1. These ten areas may be roughly indicated by counties, as follows:

1. The Dickinson - Iron - Ontonagon area.
2. The Delta - Menominee - Schoolcraft - Luce Mackinac area.
3. The Emmet - Cheboygan - Charlevoix - Otsego area.
4. The Manistee - Mason - Oceana area.
5. The Crawford - Oscoda - Roscommon - Ogemaw - Iosco - Arenac area.
6. The Huron - Tuscola - Sanilac - Lapeer area.
7. The Ionia Area.
8. The St. Joseph - Cass area.
9. The Branch area.
10. The Monroe area.

Most of the territory in these ten areas is sparsely populated. The population density averages about 25 persons per square mile, compared with a population density of about 178 per square mile in the other two-thirds of the state. To serve the educational needs and demands of people in these areas is less easy than in the more populous areas and in centers of considerable taxable wealth. Yet the need is there, and it must be met. Neither the state nor the local citizens can afford to overlook it.

6. The Commission recommends the establishment of additional community colleges in populous centers and their suburban areas where four-year colleges and universities already exist. The functions of the existing degree-granting institutions have been significantly different from those of the community college. The former have been concerned largely with the promotion of scholarship and advanced professional training, and have served primarily the needs of a selected group of those who may profit from education beyond high school. As pointed out earlier, the community college presently has five major functions. An institution which can fulfill those functions and is designed to serve the needs for post-high school education of all who can profit from it should be provided locally wherever possible.

   The provision of appropriately located community colleges to serve the Detroit metropolitan area is deserving of special study. While most community colleges have been established in areas where sizeable numbers of youth would be served, this has not been true of all parts of the Detroit area. From 1940 to 1955 the population in the metropolitan area (Wayne, Macomb, and Oakland Counties) increased much more rapidly than in the other 80 counties -- 47 per cent as compared to 30 per cent. Somewhat similar differential growth is projected for the next decade and a half. The growth and concentration of population and other criteria indicate the need for additional community colleges in Wayne and Macomb Counties and for one or more in Oakland County. Local surveys should be made, and they should be reviewed by the responsible state agency to assure a coordinated program."

The Governor's Junior and Community College Study Commission of 1956-58 also adopted and presented some viewpoints concerning the

financial support of community colleges. Like Martorana, this Commission held that the financing of community colleges was closely related to the type of organization or districting plan that might be adopted. Part of the Commissions report in respect to the financial support of community colleges is quoted as follows:

> "We have found that a great deterrent to the development of community colleges in Michigan is the system of support. This often places a heavy burden on the operating district for the instruction of resident students and always requires the operating district, the non-resident student, or both to bear an unreasonable share of the cost of instructing non-resident students. The problem applies to capital outlay as well, for the operating district must now pay a minimum of half the cost of new facilities, regardless of the number of non-residents served.
>
> We have accepted the following as basic principles concerning financial support:
>
> 1. Tuition barriers to community college attendance should be kept at a minimum. No Michigan student should be charged more in tuition and fees than he would pay in a similar curriculum in a state institution, nor more than 25% of the average per capita cost of operation of community colleges.
>
> 2. The district which operates a community college should bear some of the cost of plant and operation.
>
> 3. The state should bear a share of the cost of operation not less than the average ratio of state to local support of other locally controlled education and not more in percentage or in dollars per capita than for the freshman and sophomore programs of state institutions.
>
> 4. The state should bear a minimum share of one-half the cost of physical facilities, and more in districts of low taxing power relative to the size of the college.
>
> 5. Operating districts should be relieved of expense for the instruction of non-residents of the district.
>
> 6. The burden of support should not bear unreasonably upon

sending districts with a high ratio of students to wealth.

7. The use of buildings and facilities should be reflected in the determination of operating costs."

Report of Citizens Committee on Higher Education - March, 1965. In 1963, Governor Romney appointed a Citizens Committee on Higher Education, commonly termed the "Blue Ribbon Committee on Higher Education". In March, 1965, this Committee made its report to the Governor. Among the conclusions and recommendations contained in this report were several pertaining to community college functions, districting and financing.

In respect to the functions of community colleges, the Committee reported in part as follows.

> The basic postsecondary educational needs of the state in addition to those provided by the four-year and graduate institutions are: The first two years of college work for those who desire and prove able to pursue a baccalaureate program; the technical-vocational programs that the community and the state need and that youth and adults can use; the terminal programs needed to provide new skills and to upgrade old skills for the employed and unemployed; the counseling and guidance required to place students and adults in adequate and carefully developed programs and to help them cross over smoothly from one program to another; and in general; life-long educational opportunities beyond high school - all within commuting distance of the people.
>
> The fulfillment of these needs are services presently assigned to the modern comprehensive community college. These services have the approval of the State Department of Public Instruction, the Commission on Community College Development, the Michigan Council of Community College Administrators, and others.
>
> The philosophy of the community college is very different from that of the four-year baccalaureate institution. In exact contrast with the four-year institution, with its rigid academic programs and selective admissions policy, the community college adheres to the open door admissions policy and admits all high school graduates

and other adults who apply, and it endeavors to place them in those programs that they are prepared to undertake. It must not be looked upon as an extension of high school or as simply the first two years of college. It is an integral part of higher education, but with its own distinctive role of serving the needs of a very large number of youth and adults, a role that the four-year institution cannot perform. It is intended to be a flexible institution in areas where flexibility is most needed.

In regard to districting for community college support and operation, the Committee reported as follows:

> "The Committee believes that, within the framework of the overall state plan for higher education, it is important that each community college have its own district and its own governing board entirely separate from the K-12 school district and its governing board. The community college needs a larger district and tax base than the Michigan public school district normally has. It must develop its own educational philosophy and program, have its own faculty, its own budget and salary scale, and otherwise develop into an independent postsecondary institution. The Committee strongly recommends, therefore, that no new K-12 community college districts be recognized by the State Board of Education, and that the separate community college district be favored under the state plan...
>
> The Committee believes that it is time to block out the entire state, tentatively, into community college districts for the purpose of encouraging the development of a statewide system of community colleges and to provide an overall guide for their orderly distribution throughout the state. The Committee staff, therefore, with the help and counsel of advisers from the Commission on Community College Development, has mapped out the state into areas that appear to be most likely to develop into community college districts. The plan is based on such criteria as population, the industrial character and mix, area wealth, the location of other educational institutions, the educational level of the parents, the educational aspirations of parents and students, and transportation routes.
>
> It is understood, of course, that the final location of community colleges and the determination of district boundaries must have the approval of the State Board of Education. Such approval, of course, should be based on a careful study made by the State Board's advisory board for public community and junior colleges or by some neutral committee reporting to the Board..."

The Committee also presented some rather specifically worded viewpoints concerning the financing of community colleges. In regard to tuition charges to students, the Commission stated:

> "...The Committee believes strongly that it is fundamental to the success of the entire community college program that the part of operating costs paid by the student be such as to insure the maximum participation; that student charges be so fixed as to encourage participation rather than to discourage it; otherwise, the program will be self-defeating...
>
> ...The wide spread in tutiton charges does not seem to the Committee to be appropriate, and high tuition costs are inconsistent with the very philosophy of the community college, embodying the open door admissions policy and the desire to reach more and more of the educable people as a matter of investment in human resources. The Committee, therefore, definitely favors a move toward lower tuition charges for community colleges."

The Committee summarized its conclusions and recommendations regarding the financing of community colleges in the following par
paragraph:

> "The Committee recommends that a formula for determining state support of community colleges be devised and adopted. The formula should be disassociated entirely from the elementary and secondary school state support formula and be designed solely to meet the needs of the community college. The formula should take into account the higher cost of offering certain technical-vocational courses over the cost of offering the conventional classroom programs, the difference in the wealth of the community college districts, and the desirability of maintaining low tuition rates.
>
> The Committee feels strongly that, since it is intended that the community college programs should be available to all educable people, tuition rates should always be kept at a minimum.
>
> If the community college program is to develop throughout the state as rapidly as needed, the state will be called upon to provide more extensive capital outlay in the months and years ahead than it has provided in the past for community colleges.

The Committee recommends that the state lay early plans for meeting these increased capital needs."

As a part of its report, the Committee included in the Appendix a proposal prepared by P. Kenneth Morse entitled "Proposed Community College Centers and Community College Districts". Assuming that every Michigan resident should be included in a community college district, present or potential community college centers were identified and district lines were specified. The following five criteria were used in developing the proposed districts:

1. Expected enrollment of 500 or more
2. One mill levy yielding at least $200 per expected student
3. A significant population center
4. Major highways leading to population center
5. Commuting distance generally not in excess of 25 miles (35 miles permissible in sparsely populated areas)

The following table showing the territories to be included in the proposed districts, by counties and portions of counties, was presented by Morse. In respect to this table, it seems appropriate to point out that it was developed almost a full year before the publication of the complete report of which it became a part. Consequently, several community college districts had become organized in the meantime which were not wholly in accord with the Plan:

| District | Counties Included | Community Colleges at - |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Gogebic, Ontonagon | Ironwood* |
| 2 | Delta, Menominee | Escanaba* |
| 3 | Antrim, Charlevoix, Cheboygan, Emmet, Otsego | Pegoskey* |
| 4 | Alcona, Alpena, Montmorency Presque Isle | Alpena* |
| 5 | Benzie, Grand Traverse, Kalkaska, Leelanau | Traverse City* |
| 6 | Manistee, Mason, N½ of Oceana W½ of Lake | Ludington |
| 7 | Missaukee, Osceola, Wexford E½ of Lake, W½ of Clare | Cadillac |
| 8 | Gladwin, Midland, Isab lla E½ of Clare | Midland |
| 9 | Arenac, Bay, NW¼ of Tuscola | Bay City |
| 10 | Gratiot, Saginaw, SW¼ Tuscola | Alma, Saginaw |
| 11 | Huron, Sanilac, E½ of Tuscola | Bad Axe or Cass City Area |
| 12 | St. Clair | Port Huron* |
| 13 | Genesee, Lapeer, Shiawassee | Flint*, Lapeer, Owosso |
| 14 | Clinton, Eaton, Ingham | Lansing* |
| 15 | Ionia, Kent, Allegan (Part)** | Grand Rapids*, Ionia |
| 16 | Muskegon, S½ of Oceana | Muskegon* |
| 17 | Ottawa, Allegan (Part)** | Holland |
| 18 | Kalamazoo, Allegan (Part)** E½ Van Buren | Kalamazoo |

| District | Counties Included | Community Colleges at - |
|---|---|---|
| 19 | Barry, Calhoun | Battle Creek* |
| 20 | Livingston, Oakland | Pontiac, Royal Oak, Brighton |
| 21 | Macomb | Warren*, Mt. Clemens |
| 22 | Wayne | Livonia*, Highland Park*, Dearborn*, Grosse Pte, Wyandotte, Wayne, Detroit |
| 23 | Washtenaw | Ann Arbor |
| 24 | Jackson | Jackson* |
| 25 | Berrien, W½ of Van Buren, W½ of Cass | Benton Harbor*, Niles |
| 26 | St. Joseph, E½ of Cass | Three Rivers |
| 27 | Branch, W-3/4 of Hillsdale | Coldwater |
| 28 | Lenawee, E¼ of Hillsdale | Adrian |
| 29 | Monroe | Monroe |
| S-1 | Alger, Baraga, Chippewa, Dickinson, Houghton, Iron, Keeweenaw, Luce, Mackinac, Marquette, Schoolcraft | Special centers at Mich. Tech. (Houghton and Sault Ste. Marie and Northern Mich. (Marquette) |
| S-2 | Crawford, Iosco, Ogemaw, Oscoda, Roscommon | West Branch |
| S-3 | Mecosta, Newaygo, Montcalm | Special center at Ferris (Big Rapids) |

Alternative Plan: Retain Delta as Community College
(See Figure 2)***

| District | Counties Included | Community Colleges at - |
|---|---|---|
| 8D | Arenac, Bay, Midland, Saginaw | University Center* |
| 11D | Huron, Sanilac, Tuscola | Cass City Area |
| S-2D | Crawford, Gladwin, Iosco, Ogemaw, Oscoda, Roscommon, E½ of Clare | West Branch |
| S-3D | Gratiot, Isabella, Mecosta, Montcalm, Newaygo | Alma, special center at Ferris (Big Rapids) |

* Community college presently in existence.

** Parts of Allegan County are in Districts 15, 17, and 18. The part in District 15 is included within the boundaries of Door, Leighton, Hopkins, and Wayland Townships; the part in District 17 - Laketown, Fillmore, Overisel, Salem, Saugatuck, Manlius, Health, Monterey, Ganges, Clyde, Casco, and Lee Townships; and the part in District 18 - Valley, Allegan, Watson, Martin, Cheshire, Trowbridge, Otsego, and Gunplain Townships.

*** These districts cover the same geographic area as Districts 8, 9, 10, 11, S-2, and S-3. All other districts would remain the same.

Report of Michigan Council of Community College Administrators - 1965. On November 11, 1965, the Michigan Council of Community College Administrators adopted a position under the title of "Suggested Community College Portion of a State Plan for Higher Education". Several parts of this report are pertinent to community college districting and the financing of community college programs.

Because of its relationship to criteria for community college districting, the following quoted excerpts from the report in respect to financing seem appropriate:

A. "Properly finance all programs, particularly the more expensive technical and vocational programs. Emphasis needs to be placed on added costs for capital expenditures for technical-vocational work.

B. Keep the cost of higher education to the student within the reach of his purse.

C. Keep the cost of higher education to the community at the point where it pays a fair share but does not compel the local community to extend itself beyond appropriate limits to maintain excellence and provide necessary programs. The limit of local taxation has been reached. The disparity between the community college support and state institutional support by the State places a heavy burden upon the community for costs which legitimately belong to the State.

D. State assistance should be provided in sufficient amounts and with sufficient guarantee so that long-range planning is feasible."

This Council also presented some viewpoints concerning the establishment of community college districts. While these viewpoints do not apply directly to the identification of specific criteria for

community college districting, these might be taken into account when such identification is attempted. The viewpoints of the Council are quoted as follows:

A. "A series of community college districts will need to be developed that will blanket the state - so no citizen will live outside a community college district. A plan for the development of this system must be the responsibility of the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges though many studies have been made and much data is available on which to base decisions.

B. In addition to the verticalization described, it is recommended that the community college system be organized so that specialized programs can be developed by colleges that are in an area especially suited for a particular kind of program. In order that students throughout the state may avail themselves of these special programs, it is recommended that the state in cooperation with community colleges accept responsibility for the added cost when a student must leave his district and enroll in a community college in another district in order to avail himself of a special program. Safeguards will be required to insure against abuse of this right and against extending it to areas of instruction where it is not appropriate, or not in the best interest of the student and state.

C. Criteria for establishment of community college districts need to be revised. Consideration in the new criteria must include the different needs of different geographical areas.

   For example: - The minimum state equalized valuation for new community college districts should be raised but with a provision for waiver by the State Board of Education in a few areas with sparse population and their limited tax base.

D. Some system of equalization of opportunity must be developed, involving both curricula and finance so that funds are made available to community college districts on the basis of the number of students to be served and the kinds of curricula to be provided, rather than on the basis of local economic capability. Assuming that colleges are assisted as suggested, the

state plan and system for community colleges would provide for the development of specialized curriculums in those areas that best lend themselves to particular kinds of specialized curriculums. Provision for financing, both from the point of view of reimbursement and from the point of view of the opportunity of citizens to avail themselves of specialized curriculums, must be made.

E. A recognition of the different needs of different communities, and hence of the different community colleges. For example, the requirements of the City of Dearborn may differ greatly from those of Alpena, and thus would require different kinds of community colleges. The basic plan and system should provide legal authorization for the construction of dormitories in less populated, as well as metropolitan areas where specialized programs are offered and where students can be expected to enroll in these programs from all parts of the state. In determining districts in northern Michigan and the upper peninsula, the idea of a strictly commuting college may have to be abandoned. These colleges must have large areas involving many counties in their district if they are to have sufficient tax base and number of students. They may provide for a relatively large number of boarding students."